UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/749,418	12/28/2000	Chul Kim	P-174	5679

34610 7590 05/10/2004	EXAMINER
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP	SHAW, JOSEPH D
P.O. BOX 221200	
CHANTILLY, VA 20153	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 05/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 December 2000_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.
     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☒ Claim(s) _9-12,14-21 and 23_ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-3 and 5_ is/are rejected.
7)☒ Claim(s) _4,6-8,13 and 22_ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _28 December 2000_ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
     a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:
       1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
       2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
       3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
     Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1.   The drawings are objected to because Figures 1 and 2 disclose a "TRAP

POU" whereas the specification makes reference to the correct term, a TRAP

PDU.   A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in

reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application.   The

objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

   a.   The disclosure recites in various locations "that more than two

   objects   are   correlated   to   define   a   trap   generation   condition"

   (Abstract; page 5, lines 1-3; page 7, lines 17-21; page 9, lines 16-

   23).   However, the disclosure also recites several examples of only two

   correlated objects for defining a trap condition (objects B and C; page

   7, lines 17-21; objects A and B; page 8, lines 12-23).   Thus, the

   disclosure appears to contradict itself.   Appropriate correction is

   required.

   b.   On page 1, line 25, "MET" should be replaced with "SET."

   c.   On page 3, line 10, "agetn" should be replaced with "agent."

Claim Objections

3.   Claim 8 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper

dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous

claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. The limitation "the trap generation condition is defined by correlating more than two objects," recited in claim 8, is the same limitation as "more than two objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition" that appears claim 1.

4.   Claims 1, 8, 13, 17, and 22 are objected to because of the following informalities:

   d.   As per claims 1, 8, 13, and 22, the disclosure appears to contradict itself on the matter of how many objects are correlated to define a trap generation condition, as described above. The claims recite the limitation claiming more than two correlated objects for defining the generation of a trap. Due to the lack of clarity in the disclosure, it is unclear how to arrive at the claimed subject matter.

   e.   As per claim 17, there is an erroneous line break on line 5 that divides the word "checking" into "c" and "hecking."

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

   A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

   (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   Claims 1-3 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being
anticipated by Faigon et al. (6,006,016).

f.   As per claim 1, Faigon teaches:

a method for controlling trap generation of an SNMP which is
operated a manager and at least one agent (fault correlator collects
traps generated by an agent via SNMP and determines when to forward the
traps in the form of a meta-trap to the network management station;
col. 6, line 54 - col. 7, line 19),

wherein a TrapFlag field and a TrapPeer field are defined for
each management object resource in describing an MIB of an SNMP (Rule
Active and toggle rule, rules are associated with the various faults
and traps (managed objects) that can occur; col. 11, lines 18-30; col.
12, lines 46-49; col. 15, lines 5-57), and

more than two objects are correlated to define a trap generation
condition (toggle rule allows at least two different traps (objects) to
be correlated to generate a meta-trap to the network management server;
col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57).

g.   As per claim 2, Faigon further teaches:

the TrapFlag field being a field for indicating whether a trap is
to be generated for each object described in the MIB (Rule Active
specifies whether the rule is active or not; col. 12, lines 46-49).

h.   As per claim 3, Faigon further teaches:

a value of the TrapFlag field being set as 'ON' state or 'OFF'
state by the manager (Rule Active specifies whether the rule is active

or not, has a Boolean value, rules are specified by the network

manager; col. 12, lines 4-11, 46-49).

i.   As per claim 5, Faigon further teaches:

the TrapPeer field being a field for defining a trap generation

condition for an object (toggle rules correlate multiple traps

(objects) and the network manager is not informed unless all toggle

rules are met; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57; Fig. 14A).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis

for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically
> disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the
> differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior
> art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at
> the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the
> art to which said subject matter pertains.   Patentability shall not be
> negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Anger et al. (6,009,431) in view of Faigon et al. (6,006,016).

j.   As per claim 1, Anger teaches:

trap generation of an SNMP which is operated between a manager

and at least one agent (col. 1, lines 25-44), and

a TrapFlag field and a TrapPeer field are defined for each

management object resource in describing an MIB of an SNMP (object

defined in an MIB has various fields, one could be "TrapFlag" and

another "TrapPeer"; Figs. 3-4; col. 2, line 64 - col. 3, line 57).

However, the Faigon invention does not explicitly teach controlling the generation of traps or having more than two objects correlated to define a trap generation condition. Anger teaches:

controlling the generation of traps by having more than two objects correlated to define a trap generation condition (toggle rule allows at least two different traps (objects) to be correlated to generate a meta-trap to the network management server; col. 11, lines 18-30; col. 15, lines 5-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to control the generation of traps in the Anger invention by correlating more than two objects to define a trap generation condition, as taught by Faigon, because this would reduce the number of traps sent to the management server, reducing the burden on the management server and allowing the management server to focus attention on real changes in the managed device, like state changes, as taught by Faigon; col. 11, lines 18-30).

Allowable Subject Matter

9.   Claims 9-23 are allowed.

10.   Claims 4 and 6-7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

11.   The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

k.   Claims 9 and 14 provide two distinct elements lacking from claim
1 that make them allowable.

According to claim 9 and 14, the TrapFlag field and the TrapPeer
field are defined in an MIB of an agent.   In contrast, the claim
language of claim 1 does not clearly determine whether the fields are
defined in an MIB for an object or if they are just arbitrarily defined
anywhere in the system for the object managed in the MIB.   Therefore,
the Faigon reference taught fields that were outside of the MIB that
read on the claim.

Furthermore,   claims   9   and   14   further   define   TrapFlag   and
TrapPeer.   This is what makes claims 9 and 14 allowable over the prior
art.   Otherwise, these fields could be any arbitrary field defined in
the MIB of an agent.   No prior art teaches a field that is set in the
MIB according to a message outputted from the manager or a field that
is set by the agent according to a trap generation condition in the
MIB, as claimed in claim 9.   Furthermore, no prior art teaches traps
being generated in accordance to fields in an MIB definition being in
the ON state, as claimed in claim 14.   In addition, no prior art
provided motivation for adding such fields to an MIB of an agent.
Rather, prior art tends to parallel the Faigon invention and rely on
other solutions outside of an MIB of an agent for controlling trap
generation.

In contrast, claim 1 does not clearly define what the TrapFlag
and   TrapPeer   fields   are   or   what   they   do   until   claim   4   and   6
respectively, and therefore are interpreted to by any field in the MIB
taught by Anger.   Claim 4 claims that an agent will not generate a
trap with the TrapFlag field in the 'OFF' state.   In Faigon and other

prior arts, the agent generates a trap regardless and the trap is handled later by some other means, and the 'ON/OFF' states control the other means. Claim 6 claims that the TrapPeer field is an 'ON/OFF' state and that it is controlled by the agent, also not taught by the prior art.

Conclusion

12.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph D Shaw whose telephone number is 703-305-0094. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday and alternate Fridays, 7am - 4pm.

13.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 703-305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

14.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joseph Shaw
Examiner
AU 2141

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER